

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interviews conducted on October 11, 2007 and October 16, 2007. During the interviews, the specification objection and the statutory-type double patenting rejection of claims 14-46 were discussed. The Examiner agreed that the statutory-type double patenting rejection of claims 14-46 was improper, however, the Examiner stated that claims 14-46 were still rejected under obvious-type double patenting for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Final Office Action. It was agreed that a terminal disclaimer for claims 14-46 would be filed with this response, and that claims 25 and 36 would be amended to obviate the currently applied claim and specification objections.

In the Final Office Action, dated September 4, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 14-46. By this Response, Applicants have amended claims 25 and 36. These amendments do not add new matter. Applicants have also filed a terminal disclaimer with respect to claims 14-46. Currently, claims 14-46 remain pending in the present application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments, the currently filed terminal disclaimer, and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

**Claim Amendments**

Applicants have made amendments to claims 25 and 36 in response to the Final Office Action mailed September 4, 2007. The amendments do not narrow the scope of claims but rather have been made to more clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter recited. Further, no new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments, and support for the amendments may be found at least on page 4, lines 20-21, page 5, lines 10-11, and

page 7, lines 5-6. It is believed that these amendments obviate the claim objection of claim 25 and the specification objection with regard to claims 36-46. As such, Applicants respectfully request removal of the current claim and specification objections.

**Claim Rejections under the Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting**

As stated above, and agreed upon during the telephonic interviews with the Examiner, the Examiner rejected claims 14-46 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,600,503 (hereinafter “the ‘503 patent”). Although Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection, Applicants submit herewith a properly-executed terminal disclaimer to further prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully submit that the enclosed terminal disclaimer obviates the Examiner’s obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Further, because obviousness-type double patenting was the sole basis for the Examiner’s rejection of claims 14-46, Applicants assert that these claims are currently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the instant rejection as to claims 14-46, and allowance of claims 14-46.

**Conclusion**

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections and allowance of all pending claims 14-46. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Barry D. Blount  
Reg. No. 35,069  
(281) 970-4545

Date: October 30, 2007

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**  
**HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400